

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2002

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09 664,094	09 19 2000	Masayuki Mizuno	Q60884	5281		
7:	590 10 31 2002					
Sughrue Mion Zinn MacPeak & Seas PLLC			EXAMINER			
2100 Pennsylva Washington, D	nnia Avenue NW C 20037-3213		MONDT, JO	MONDT, JOHANNES P		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2826			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	Application No.	pplicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/664,094	MIZUNO, MASAYUI	ΚI
Auvisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Johannes P Mondt	2826	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 22 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period o fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of t (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amon he shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	cause.		
(a) : they raise new issues that would require furthe	r consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by mater	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
NOTE See Continuation Sheet.			
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NO	Γ place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(explanation of how the new or amended claims wo	· •		nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-9</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on $___$ is a	a) approved or b) disappr	oved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	t(s)(PFO-1449) Paper No(s)	·	
SUPERV	VISORY PATENT EXAMINER		





Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendment of the claim language raises U.S.C. 112, first paragraph issues because the wall of a through hole in a signal line is by necessity electrically connected to said signal line, said wall being by definition an interface of the through-hole and said signal line, and said signal line being electrically conductive. Therefore, the formulation of the further limitation would have to be significantly modified in view of the requirement of enablement. Applicant is reminded of the stated purpose in Toyoda et al (see Abstract in English) to control impedance in transmission lines such as a microstrip line being formed throughout a surface-side and rear-side signal line by providing through-holes in it.